REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-21 are pending in the application. Claim 22 has been withdrawn by the Examiner. Upon entry of this Amendment, claims 2, 3, 5, 6, 8 – 10, 15, 16, and 19 – 21 will be amended and claims 1 and 4 will be canceled, and the application specification will be amended to correct a typographical error.

In the outstanding Office Action of November 10, 2005, the Examiner noted that objected to claim 5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, which the Examiner identified as claims 1 and 4, since the Examiner assumed claim 5 to depend from claim 4 to avoid an antecedent basis problem. Claim 5 has now been so amended. Accordingly, claim 5 should now be in condition for allowance.

In connection with the above-noted amendment to claim 5, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16, 19 and 20 have also been amended to change their dependence from now-canceled claim 1 to amended claim 5. Accordingly, such claims and the remaining dependent claims which depended from such claims, *i.e.*, claims 6, 7, 11-14, 17 and 18, should now also be in condition for allowance.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 2, 5 and 16 on the basis of problems with antecedent bases. In view of the amendments to claims 2, 5 and 16, the Examiner's objections to these claims should now be withdrawn.

The Examiner also rejected claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement because claim 21 recites a function

that is the exact opposite of claim 1. In claim 1, which has now been canceled in favor of claim 5, the biasing means is recited as biasing the rudder toward a non-steering position and the actuating means is recited as actuating movement of the rudder toward a steering position automatically, upon the speed of the watercraft dropping below a predetermined level. Conversely, claim 21 recites that the actuating means automatically actuates movement of the rudder toward the non-steering position, upon the speed of the watercraft dropping below a predetermined level, and the biasing means biasing the rudder toward the steering position. Support for the reversal in function described in claim 21 appears at least at the bottom of page 9 and the top of page 10 of the application specification. To avoid the problem of enablement identified by the Examiner under the first paragraph of Section 112, claim 21 has now been amended to place it in independent form so as to not be dependent upon claim 5. As such, the Examiner's rejection of claim 21 under §112, first paragraph, should now be withdrawn.

With regard to the Examiner's claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§102 and 103, given the placement of objected to claim 5 in independent form so as to include the limitations of claims 1 and 4, and the change of dependency from the claims which depended from claim 1 to now independent claim 5, such claims should now be in condition for allowance and the prior art rejections for such claims are now moot.

With regard to claim 21, the Examiner did not reject such claim on the basis of prior art. Given that such claim is substantially similar in scope to that of claim 5, except for the recitation of the change in functions of the biasing means, and the actuating

means, such claim should now also be allowable over the cited prior art, and thus, in condition for allowance.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that all of the claims remaining in the application, *i.e.*, claims 2, 3 and 5-21, are now in condition for allowance, which action is earnestly solicited. If any issues remain in this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C.

By: _____

Robert A. Molan
Reg. No. 29,834

RAM:dt
901 North Glebe Road, 11th Floor
Arlington, VA 22203
Telephone: (703) 816-4000
Facsimile: (703) 816-4100

1040325